

Dear Alan,

6/10/84

Tad Sculc's piece in this morning's Post -- and I always have questions about Sculc when he writes about intelligence matters -- prompts this supplement to what I wrote you yesterday.

I'm familiar with some of Sculc's books and have substantial questions about all of them. Not long before he left the Times he had a major early Watergate piece in which, from personal knowledge, he identified Howard Hunt as Bernard Barker -- where it made a difference. Today he has the Office of Policy Coordination as the 1949 forerunner of CIA.

While the chances <sup>are poor</sup> of getting any judge not to agree with the CIA's claim that disclosing what Miller wants in his Albania CIA FOIA lawsuit <sup>would hurt</sup>, with a judge like Harold Green there is a way of approaching it and perhaps succeeding. Chances not good but I think a possibility, once their affidavits are read carefully.

Affidavits reminds me: those were filed very long ago. Yet Sculc uses them only now, in a piece that some in the CIA might be very happy about, and where by careful indirection he stretches the truth about and makes the CIA look better. He says that the CIA's general counsel would not be so frivolous as to file any untruthful affidavits. Actually, the DJ filed the affidavits. The CIA supplied them and it is not likely that the general counsel prepared them. If Sculc knows anything about the CIA he knows that they lie under oath all the time. So, I presume that some wanted this piece done and that is why Sculc did it.

It is the CIA's claim that disclosing what is asked for about the post World War II period has to be withheld because it might let the Soviets know how dependable an informer KGB Philby was. Or, Philby is the one who tipped the Soviets off when the CIA and perhaps British had agents in Albania. Superficially, this appears to be a reasonable posture.

Now my recollections of that period may not be completely accurate, but what I suggest is a method, whether or not in this instance relevant.

First of all, the agents we and the British <sup>then</sup> had in the Balkans who were anti-left were largely if not entirely those who had been with the defeated right. And they were conspicuous and caught with great regularity, and not only in Albania. Throughout the Balkans. So, it is not unlikely that they would have been caught and were caught without any Philby tipoffs. Then there is the question of where Albania stood politically in the period in question. Here is where I'm not certain of my recollection but at a time that I believe is the time in question it was not friendly with the USSR. It was anti-Soviet and pro Mao. If correct, then there is every reason not to believe that the Soviets tipped the Albanians off. They then were bitter enemies. And on this basis the judge can be asked to make an in camera inspection of the underlying records and the CIA's and your affidavits. The in camera material, if I am correct, also is before the appeals court, not just the CIA's affidavit. If what I believe is correct, the CIA will have no underlying records to support its Philby story.

I'm opening the envelope to insert this.

Best wishes,